

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner deemed Applicant's reply filed December 20, 2006 to be not fully responsive, because claims were added without providing a listing of the added claims readable on the elected embodiments.


In response, Applicant submits that claims 65-70, as newly submitted in the response of December 20, 2006, more particularly describe features of the panel device of the claimed combination. These features are supported by the specification, for example, in Figures 1 and 2.

Applicant submits that claims 65-70 read on the species of Group I (Figures 1-5), as elected in Applicant's Response dated September 25, 2006. Claims 2, 4, 5, 11-15, and 42-70 (as pending) each read on the elected species.

Applicant submits that the defect identified by the Examiner in Applicant's reply of December 20, 2006 has now been cured. An action on the merits is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

**BENJAMIN CHLADNY**

By   
James A. Raakman  
Reg. No. 56,624  
(416) 957-1654